

and dedicated in November 1896, at a total cost of slightly more than \$2500 and at that time was nearly debt-free. On March 8, 1903, 32 people met in the chapel and organized themselves into what has since been known as the Ridgewood Baptist Church. During that March, a church covenant was adopted, a baptistry was built and the Plano Baptist Church donated their old church pews. Out of this humble beginning, Ridgewood Baptist Church emerged.

The Church has grown in many ways since its humble beginnings. Today, around 300 people attend services at Ridgewood Baptist Church. In 1974, the Church opened its doors to their new school, Ridgewood Baptist Academy. Reverend Albert Baker is the current pastor of the Church. Reverend Baker's vision for the church is to have more land for the sports programs at the school. He also desires spiritual growth for his people and a desire to share their worship with others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to identify and recognize other groups in their own districts whose actions have so greatly benefitted and strengthened America's families and communities.

HONORING ROY T. YANASE, D.D.S.

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend and true legend, Dr. Roy Yanase, a nationally and internationally prominent prosthodontist. I have known Dr. Yanase for more than a decade and am honored to pay tribute to his professional accomplishments and his dynamic mentoring of hundreds of dental students throughout Southern California.

Dr. Yanase's energy is boundless, his smile matchless, and his compassion far-reaching. He graduated from the University of Southern California in 1969 and returned there for advanced training in a residency to obtain his Board Certification as a Prosthodontist in 1981. Dr. Yanase has been on the faculty of the University of Southern California School of Dentistry since 1969 and presently serves as a Clinical Professor of Continuing Education and Advanced Prosthodontic Education.

Over the past 25 years, Dr. Yanase has lectured internationally and throughout the United States. His writings on the specialty of prosthodontics have appeared in several publications as well as three major textbooks.

Dr. Yanase has held responsible positions in several national and regional organizations including serving as Founder, President and current Treasurer of the Osseointegration Study Club of Southern California; member of the Board of the American College of Prosthodontists and President of its California Section; Prosthodontic consultant for the California State Board of Dental Examiners; President of the Southern California Japanese-American Dental Society; and President of the Pacific Coast Society of Prosthodontists.

Dr. Yanase has been elected as a Fellow of the American College of Dentists, the International College of Dentists, the American College of Prosthodontists, the International College of Prosthodontists, the Pierre

Fauchard Academy and the Academy of Dentistry International.

Besides his Fellowships, Dr. Yanase is an active member of the Pacific Coast Society of Prosthodontists, American Academy of Geriatric Dentistry, the Newport Harbor Academy of Dentistry, Omicron Kappa Upsilon and the Japanese American Dental Society.

Dr. Yanase and his wife Regina have been married for 33 years and live in Torrance.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride that I recognize the exceptional life of Dr. Roy Yanase. I congratulate him for his many accomplishments and wish him and his family the best of luck in years to come.

JAPANESE AMERICANS

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most concise rebuttals that I have read to the notion that Japanese Americans were placed in the camps because they either posed a national security threat or for their own safety comes from a law professor from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill in a letter dated February 7, 2003. I would like to submit this letter at this point in the Record.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
CHAPEL HILL

Chapel Hill, North Carolina, February 7, 2003.

Hon. HOWARD COBLE,

*U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COBLE: I am a professor of law at the University of North Carolina School of Law in Chapel Hill. My areas of expertise include constitutional law and especially the story of the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. My book on the subject, *Free to Die for their Country: The Story of the Japanese American Draft Resisters in World War II* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001), was named one of the Washington Post's Top Nonfiction Titles for 2001.

I have followed with interest and concern the story about your comments on the radio on Tuesday morning to the effect that you support the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, and that the Roosevelt administration interned Japanese Americans to protect them.

I note that you were quoted in the High Point Enterprise as saying the following: "I still stand by what I said . . . that, in no small part, it (internment) was done to protect the Japanese-Americans themselves." The article further states that you said that if it were proven to you that protecting Japanese Americans was not one of FDR's motivations, you will apologize.

Here is the proof.

Just after the Pearl Harbor attack, FDR, asked Navy Secretary Frank Knox to investigate the possibility, that Fifth Column work by people of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii had contributed to the success of the Japanese sneak attack. Knox reported his conclusions to FDR by December 15, and on that day, said to reporters that he thought "the most effective Fifth Column work of the entire war was done in Hawaii with the possible exception of Norway." J. Edgar Hoover immediately registered his strong disagreement with Knox's conclusions, and it turns out that Knox was wrong and Hoover was right. But it was Knox's views that were made public, and they triggered hysteria on the West Coast.

Well before the war, FDR, anticipating a possible war with Japan, had commissioned his own secret intelligence investigation of Japanese aliens and their loyalties. Leading this effort were John Franklin Carter (an author and columnist) and Curtis Munson (a prominent Republican businessman). And the Office of Naval Intelligence ("ONI") and the FBI were for quite some time before Pearl Harbor, gathering names of Japanese aliens who might need to be apprehended in the event of war. ONI and the FBI actually compiled a list of such aliens which came to be called the "ABC" list—so named because the list presented three categories (Category A, Category B, and Category C) of potentially dangerous aliens. (In the days after Pearl Harbor, all of the aliens in these three categories were in fact arrested—a total of some 1500.)

Carter and Munson's investigations had led them to conclude that the overwhelming majority of Japanese aliens and an even greater percentage of American citizens of Japanese ancestry were in fact loyal to the United States, and that of those whose loyalty was even questionable, few could be expected even to consider actually doing something to support Japan or undermine the United States. Carter and Munson grew alarmed by Knox's report and the anti-Japanese outcry that followed it.

Carter and Munson quickly put together a plan for FDR's consideration that was designed to bolster the Japanese American communities of Hawaii and the West Coast. Their plan called for a number of things: FDR was urged to go on record as believing in the loyalty of American citizens of Japanese ancestry (the "Nisei"). The Nisei should be invited to volunteer (and then should be accepted) for patriotic service in the Red Cross and civilian defense. The Nisei should be encouraged to take control of their alien parents' property. Once investigated, the Nisei should be allowed to take jobs in defense plants. Carter and Munson also urged the government to work closely with the Japanese American Citizens League, which had indicated its willingness to serve as a loyal liaison with the Japanese American community.

The goals of the Carter-Munson plan were many, but they included the discouragement of vigilante violence against Japanese Americans and Japanese aliens. The hope was that if FDR came out quickly and loudly in support of people of Japanese ancestry, and involved them quickly in activities that would permit their loyalty and patriotism to shine through, others would not see them as a threat.

The Carter-Munson plan was submitted to Roosevelt before Christmas. By mid-January, it was completely forgotten—suspended by other pressures that I'll detail in a moment. And here's the important point: the Carter-Munson plan was the only plan for dealing with Japanese Americans that took their security into account in any way. It never got off the ground.

Why didn't it get off the ground? For four main reasons.

First, by late January 1942, General John DeWitt (the commanding officer of the West Coast Defense Command) and his advisor Karl Bendetsen had become persuaded that mass action to remove all people of Japanese ancestry from the West Coast was necessary for military reasons. Their viewpoint was fed largely by outrageous rumors of Japanese American subversion, none of which ever panned out.

Second, by mid-January, a rabidly racist press along the Coast had begun campaigning for the eviction of all "Japs" from the area—not for their protection, but because they could not be trusted.

Third, white farmers in California began lobbying ferociously for the removal of all people of Japanese ancestry—not to protect them, and not even really for national security reasons, but to drive the very successful Japanese farming industry out of business.

And fourth, their lobbying, and the voices of the editorialists, succeeded in pushing most of the congressional delegations of the West Coast states to demand mass exclusion.

As Professor Greg Robinson says in his authoritative treatment of the subject, "By Order of the President; FDR, and the Internment of Japanese Americans" (Harvard U. Press, 2001). "the binding factor among these disparate social, economic, and military forces was racial animosity toward Japanese Americans." (p.90)

Through late January and early February, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and his staff fought with the military to prevent mass action against Japanese Americans. But it was too late. On February 11, 1942, Secretary of War Henry Stimson sent FDR a memo asking whether he'd be willing to support "mov[ing] Japanese citizens as well as aliens from restricted areas." Getting no response, Stimson phoned FDR on February 15 to ask for a meeting on the memo. FDR said he was too busy for a meeting, but in "very vigorous" tones told Stimson that the military should do whatever they thought best. FDR predicted that "there would probably be some repercussions but it has got to be dictated by military necessity."

On February 19, 1942, FDR signed Executive Order 9066, which gave the military carte blanche to do what they wished with Japanese, aliens and American citizens of Japanese ancestry along the West Coast.

There is the proof. A concern for protecting Japanese Americans had nothing whatsoever to do with the decision to force Japanese Americans behind barbed wire. Nothing.

(My sources for this account include Greg Robinson's book, *Peter Irons's Justice at War*, and *Personal Justice Denied*, the report of Congress's Commission on the Wartime Internment and Relocation of Civilians. This, you'll recall, was the fact-finding Commission that Congress created in the early 1980s to investigate the internment. Their report, condemning the internment, led to the passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, signed into law by President Reagan, which apologized to surviving internees for the internment, and authorized the payment to each of them of a token \$20,000 redress payment. You will also recall that you spoke and voted against this bill.

I hope that you will take this opportunity to admit the mistake in your comments of Tuesday morning and apologize for them.

Thank you for considering this.

Sincerely,

ERIC L. MULLER,
Professor of Law.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICA'S WILDERNESS PROTECTION ACT

HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House today to introduce the America's Wilderness Protection Act—a bill to apply urgency and accountability to the process of evaluating potential wilderness by setting firm deadlines.

There are 666 wilderness study areas across the nation that were designated more

than 10 years ago, totaling nearly 23 million acres in 18 states. In Idaho alone there are 86 wilderness study areas totaling about 3.1 million acres.

Sixty-three of the 67 Idaho parcels managed by the Bureau of Land Management have been locked up since the early 1980s—even though 40 of them have been found unsuitable for wilderness protection. The other four have been withdrawn from multiple-use since 1976. Most of the 19 Forest Service wilderness study areas have been in place since the mid-1980s and two have held that status since 1972.

That means Congress has dragged its feet and obstructionists have gladly accepted the do-nothing status quo on these lands through the administrations of seven presidents and during the entire lifetime of many working people in Idaho.

The problem stems from the failure of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, which created the wilderness study area process, to provide for release of areas eventually deemed unsuitable for wilderness designation.

America's Wilderness Protection Act addresses that intractable situation by establishing a timetable for completion of wilderness studies. Lands designated as study areas would be released from that status on the earlier of: (1) 10 years after the legislation is enacted; (2) the date the area is designated wilderness by Congress, or (3) the date that the secretary of Interior or Agriculture determines the area is unsuitable for wilderness designation.

In the past, some have referred to acreage allowed to languish as wilderness study areas for decades as "de facto wilderness." This term is too kind. Designated wilderness has the advantage under law of being actively managed to retain its values. Wilderness study areas, on the other hand, are virtually untouched. These lands are left to overgrowth, disease and infestation by noxious weeds and other invasive species. They become ripe for catastrophic wildfires that threaten not only the acreage being "studied" for preservation but nearby private and public land as well.

Critics contend this bill would eliminate any incentive for ranchers and other multiple-use advocates to become engaged in earnest discussions of possible wilderness designations. The argument goes that they would only have to wait out the process and protection ultimately would be denied any parcel they choose. That couldn't be further from the truth.

There are no more avid outdoors enthusiasts and conservationists than those who make their living from the land. They have a deep understanding of the cycles of life and the value of protecting and cherishing the natural world. They appreciate the importance of stewardship; it's a principle they embody every day.

While the land itself is timeless, the scenic, cultural, habitat and aesthetic values of any particular tract—if left to the ravages of time—are decidedly limited. Just as vulnerable are the economic futures of the many families whose livelihoods have been stripped away by the loss of access to so much of what now can only laughingly be called 'public' land in the West.

This legislation promotes resolution and collaboration. After a generation of paralyzing indecision and refusal to accept responsibility,

the 108th Congress has an historic opportunity—if it can muster the wisdom and courage to embrace it.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CONGRESSMAN VERNON J. EHLERS

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my colleague, Congressman VERNON J. EHLERS of Grand Rapids, MI, on receiving the prestigious 2002 Philip Hauge Abelson Prize.

The Abelson Prize is awarded annually to honor a public servant for exceptional contributions to advancing science, or a scientist for a distinguished career of scientific achievement. It is granted by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the world's largest general scientific organization and publisher of the journal, "Science."

This award is much deserved. Congressman EHLERS received his Ph.D. in nuclear physics from the University of California at Berkeley in 1960. In 1966 he began teaching at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, MI and later became chairman of the college's physics department. Following a distinguished career in teaching, scientific research and community service, Congressman EHLERS joined this body in 1994, becoming the nation's first research physicist elected to Congress. He serves the 3rd Congressional District of Michigan, which directly borders the district I represent.

While serving, Congressman EHLERS has employed his scientific expertise to the benefit of our country. In 1997 the House Speaker selected him to review and restate the nation's science policy. The study, "Unlocking Our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy," was the first full policy statement on federal science and technology by the U.S. Congress. In addition, he currently serves as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards for the House Science Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman EHLERS brings to this body both a unique scientific background and a strong commitment to use his knowledge and abilities for the public good. Please allow me to congratulate him once again on his most recent honor and thank him for his exemplary public service.

THE PRESIDENT STILL HAS NOT MADE THE CASE THAT WAR AGAINST IRAQ IS NECESSARY AT THIS TIME

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grave concern over the Bush Administration's approach toward Iraq.

I believe that this Administration is now, and has always been, determined to go to war and that it has never taken all the steps available